

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (US 2001/0038372).

Claims 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Okuzono et al. (US 2001/0043178).

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 4 is objected to for minor informalities.

The specification is objected to for minor informalities.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended the specification and claims 4, 5, and 8 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are pending for further consideration.

Specification Objections

The specification is objected to for minor informalities. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to for minor informalities. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 4 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 4 be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 5 and 8 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (US 2001/0038372), and claims 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Okuzono et al. (US 2001/0043178). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display wherein “the modulated data have a data width not wider than that of the input data and not narrower than that of the most significant bit data.” Similarly, independent claim 5 recites a modulator modulating the most significant bits of an n^{th} frame, “wherein the modulated most significant bits have a data width not wider than that of input data and not narrower than that of the most significant bits of the $(n-1)^{\text{th}}$ frame,” and independent claim 9 recites a data modulator modulating most significant bits of the video data “based on a look-up table having a data width not wider than that of the input data and not narrower than that of the most significant bits.”

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, the method disclosed by Lee includes modifying the most significant bit (MSB) data using a gray look-up table and modifying the remaining bits of data by computation. For example, Lee teaches at paragraph [0140] that "[a]s the combiner 410 provides MSB 4-bit gray data $G_m[0:3]$ of the present frame, and MSB 4-bit gray data $G_{m-1}[0:3]$ of the previous frame, the values f , a and b stored in the lookup table are extracted and provided to the calculator 464." Moreover, Lee teaches at paragraph [0141] that "the calculator 464 receives the LSB 4-bit gray data $G_m[4:7]$ of the present frame from the combiner 410, the LSB 4-bit gray data $G_{m-1}[4:7]$ of the previous frame from the frame memory 420, the variables f , a and b to modify the moving pictures from the lookup table." Accordingly, Lee fails to teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 1, 5, and 9, as detailed above.

Applicant further asserts that the Office Action does not rely on Okuzono et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Lee. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Okuzono et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Lee.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103 should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:  _____
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: January 9, 2004

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000